

EXHIBIT B

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
3

4 IN RE: PROCESSED EGG PRODUCTS: MDL NO. 2002
5 ANTITRUST LITIGATION 08-MDL-02002

6 - - - - -
7 PHILADELPHIA, PA
8 - - - - -

9 NOVEMBER 25, 2019
10 - - - - -
11

12 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE GENE E.K. PRATTER, J.
13

14 - - - - -
15 TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

16 DAY 16
17 - - - - -
18

19
20
21 KATHLEEN FELDMAN, CSR, CRR, RPR, CM
22 Official Court Reporter
23 Room 1234 - U.S. Courthouse
24 601 Market Street
25 Philadelphia, PA 19106
 (215) 779-5578

(Transcript produced by mechanical shorthand via C.A.T.)

1 and what we don't know, the research. And those were the
2 two -- the two main reasons. But the industry accepted our
3 guidelines in principle in 2000 and then they worked through,
4 how do we transition to get to that point.

5 Q. So did the Scientific Advisory
6 Committee's recommendations provide a time period for
7 implementation of the guidelines?

8 A. We did not.

9 Q. Did the UEP Guidelines provide a time period for
10 implementation?

11 A. Yes, they did.

12 Q. Did the Scientific Advisory Committee recommendations
13 provide for an audit program?

14 A. No. We anticipated there would be one but we -- we
15 didn't think about it at the beginning. We anticipated that
16 there would be later, but we did not recommend that at the
17 beginning.

18 Q. And did the UEP Guidelines contain an audit?

19 A. Oh, yes. And there were many groups, FMI, NCCR,
20 McDonald's, Burger King calling, and they set up their own,
21 some of them set up their own.

22 Q. Did the Scientific Advisory Committee's recommendations
23 provide any provisions or recommendations for certification of
24 producers who complied with the recommendations?

25 A. No.